

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-48 are in the case. The applicants have studied the office action mailed December 15, 2004 and have made the changes believed appropriate to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to the specification. Applicants have amended paragraphs [0001] and [0016] of the specification to provide the serial numbers of the cited applications as kindly suggested by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

1. The Claims as Amended Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2

Claims 1-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 17 and 33 have been amended to clarify the antecedent basis of the method call requesting information and to which the requested information is returned to overcome the Section 112, par. 2 rejection.

Claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 34, and 43 were amended to change “services” to “service engines” to overcome the Section 112, par. 2 rejection.

The typographical error noted by the Examiner in claims 11 and 43 has been corrected.

The Examiner has taken the position that it is unclear whether claim 33 claims an article of manufacture or a program code or a process of enabling access to a plurality of service engines. The applicants respectfully disagree.

The Application expressly defines an “article of manufacture” as “used herein refers to code or logic implemented in a computer readable medium accessed and executed by a processor” or code “accessible through a transmission media or from a file server over a network.” (Application, pgs. 30-31, para. 74) Thus, the claims are directed to code or logic implemented in a tangible medium (i.e., the computer readable medium or transmission media) that causes operations to be performed as recited in the limitations.

The Manual of Patent Examination and Procedure (MPEP) states that “a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus

statutory.” MPEP Sec. 2106(a), pg. 2100-13. Here, the claims are directed to an article of manufacture expressly defined as code or logic implemented in a tangible medium (e.g., computer readable medium, transmission media, etc.) that defines structural and functional interrelationships which permit the code and logic functionality to be realized. All the limitations comprise the functionality implemented in the article of manufacture.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the “article of manufacture claims” are sufficiently definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. §112.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims as indefinite should be withdrawn.

1. Claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17-26, 29, 31, 33-42, 45, and 47 are Patentable Over the Cited Art
Claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17-26, 29, 31, 33-42, 45, and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,243 to Putzolu et al. in view of U.S. No. 2002/0143949 to Rajarajan. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview in which the Examiner confirmed that the references to paragraph 001 on pages 4 and 5 of the office action are in error and should be references to paragraph 0011 of the Rajarajan reference.

Independent claims 1, 17, and 33 concern enabling access to a plurality of service engines, wherein each service engine enables access to service resources, and require: providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class; instantiating a service object for one service engine in response to at least one called method from one of the service class implementations, wherein the service object includes information on the service engine; receiving a method call from one service class implementation requesting information on service engine resources for one named service; and using the service object to access the requested information to return to the method call.

The Examiner cited the Abstract and col. 7, line 60 to col. 8, line 12 as teaching the claim requirement of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited cols. 7-8 mention that each resource on a network is accessible by agents via a service, such as the hard disk drive on each device is accessible by a disk service type. Applicants submit that the cited cols. 7-8 nowhere teach or suggest providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed. In fact, cols. 7-8 teach away from this requirement because the cited cols. 7-8 mention that “[d]ifferent types of services provide access to underlying resources in a different manner and interface with agents in a different manner” and that “the actual service class used by an agent to access a service type on each device may be different”. Thus, cols. 7-8 do not teach service class implementations from different vendors providing an implementation from a same abstract service class, and instead mention how services for different resources use different types of services and service classes, not implementations of the same abstract service class as claimed.

Moreover, the cited cols. 7-8 also nowhere teach or suggest service class implementations for service engines from different vendors. The cited cols. 7-8 mention different types of services for different resources, but not service class implementations from a same abstract service class for different vendors as claimed.

The cited Abstract discusses allowing agents to function on devices having resources and that agents may move from an environment on one device to an environment on another device. Nowhere does the cited Abstract teach or suggest providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed.

The Examiner further cited pg. 2, para. [0011], pg. 12, para. [0101] , and pg. 7, paras. 0072]-[0074] of Rajarajan. (Office Action, 4) Applicants submit that the cited Rajarajan also fails to teach or suggest the claim requirement of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class.

The cited para. [0011] mentions managing a plurality of resources, and receiving information from resources related to different tasks, but where the different tasks are associated with a same object type. A method stores information from one resource in association with another resources. The cited para. [0101] mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request to collect dynamic tasks and that dynamic task information relates to functions that may be performed on a data object. The cited paras. [0072]-[0074] mentions that a

configuration manager communicates with resources added to the system to configure the resources for management. The configuration manager also provides other managers information related to the added resource to communication with that resource. The configuration manager may be a web service having methods other managers may use to get information about the resources.

Nowhere does the cited Rajarajan teach, suggest or mention the claim requirement of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 17, and 33 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-16, 18-32, and 34-48 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art. The below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed.

Claims 3, 19, and 35 depend from claims 1, 17, and 33 and further require that the service engines include workflow products from different vendors. The Examiner cited pg. 20, para. [0175] from Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0175] mentions locating and working with objects of differing types without having to navigate through varying applications. Instead of requiring the user to navigate to an application and then to a group of objects, the framework allows the user to navigate directly to the object and perform all tasks associated with the object. Nowhere in the cited para. [0175] is there any teaching, suggestion or mention of service engines including workflow products from different vendors.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 3, 19, and 35 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 4, 20, and 36 depend from claims 3, 19, and 35 and further require that the workflow service class implementations from different vendors each includes methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations.

The Examiner further cited pg. 2, para. [0011], pg. 12, para. [0101], and pg. 7, paras. [0072]-[0074] of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0011] mentions managing a plurality of resources, and receiving information from resources related to different tasks, but where the different tasks are associated with a same object type. A method stores information from one resource in association with another resources. The cited para. [0101] mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request to collect dynamic tasks and that dynamic task information relates to functions that may be performed on a data object. The cited paras. [0072]-[0074] mention that a configuration manager communicates with resources added to the system to configure the resources for management. The configuration manager also provides other managers information related to the added resource to communication with that resource. The configuration manager may be a web service having methods other managers may use to get information about the resources.

Nowhere do the above cited paragraphs of Rajarajan teach or suggest workflow service class implementations from different vendors including methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations. The cited paras. 72-74 discuss how a configuration manager configures and registers resources, and provides a web service to allow access to information about the resources. However, there is still no teaching, suggestion or mention of the claim requirement of workflow service class implementations from different vendors including methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 3, 19, and 35 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Applicants further submit that the additional requirements of other of the dependent claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

2. Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Wollrath (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,607). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that the cited claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-48 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 15, 2005

By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984